

REMARKS:

Claims 1-13 have been rejected with patents to Castillo, Gentile, Swanson, and Mascarenhas were cited as references. The claims have been amended as claims 14-23 herein. The claims have been amended in such a way as to describe the present invention more particularly. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections in addition to amending the claims.

Specifically, the new independent claims have been written to more particularly describe that the at least one section comprises a left hood member, right hood member, left nose member, right nose member, left side member, and right side member. Based on the foregoing, it is Applicant's position that the combination of features now appearing in the independent claims would not have been obvious, and that the cited references lack an indication of motivation to combine such features. None of the cited references suggest or teach towards this invention, which is a protective covering for under a vehicle nose bra or halter, not a bra or halter for exterior use itself. All of the references cited are complete inventions in and of themselves and are not intended for this inventions' intermediate use between the vehicle's exterior surface area and the exterior vehicle nose bra or halter, as they are known in the industry.

The method and claims now also require the use of an exterior vehicle nose bra or halter; the claimed invention is the intermediate protective covering, much of which the making and using is implied to one skilled in the art in the specifications if not expressly stated.

Applicant respectfully brings to the Examiner's attention that the method steps in

Gentile are not as detailed, are different and not addressed to this intermediate protective covering use. Also, Applicant respectfully brings to the Examiner's attention that the method steps in Castillo are merely stated in the specifications, not claimed as the invention. Castillo uses a squeegee only in the specifications, not the claims. Applicant submits that these combinations for this particular use is not obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the cited art was filed. Swanson predates Gentile and Castillo and if this invention would have been obvious at the time Swanson was filed Swanson would have claimed it; he did not.

No one has claimed this novel use until this Applicant filed the instant application. Applicants respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider his objections in light of the new claims and argument above that this use is new and useful and non-obvious in this combination to one skilled in the art.

DRAWINGS

Applicant here encloses amended drawings as requested by the Examiner.